

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

FILED

CLERK'S OFFICE

FELIX ESPOSITO  
and ACCESS WITH SUCCESS, INC.,  
Plaintiffs

05-19349 WGY

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
BOSTON, MASS.v.  
BEST WESTERN INTERNATIONAL  
INC.,  
29 HANCOCK STREET LLC,  
ADAMS INN FACILITIES, INC.  
DefendantsRECEIPT # 62274  
AMOUNT \$ 250  
SUMMONS ISSUED 4/5  
LOCAL RULE 4.1  
WAIVER FORM  
MCF ISSUED  
BY DPTY. CLK *form*  
DATE 2/27/05COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMANDINTRODUCTION

This is an action seeking injunctive, declaratory and equitable relief pursuant to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, *et seq.*, Article 114 of the Massachusetts Constitution, and Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 93 § 103. The plaintiffs, Felix Esposito and Access with Success, Inc. (“AWS”), through their counsel, bring this cause of action against Best Western Adams Inn and as causes of action allege as follows:

PARTIES

1. The plaintiff, Access with Success, Inc., (“AWS”) is a non-profit corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Its members are able-bodied individuals and qualified individuals with disabilities as defined by the ADA. Its members include Felix Esposito. Mr. G. David Iverson is also a member. Mr. Iverson who is a T8-9 complete paraplegic secondary to a gunshot wound. He relies completely upon a wheelchair for ambulation. Mr. Peter A. Spalluto, age 58, who is quadriplegic due to a swimming pool diving

accident in 1966, is also a member. He always uses a wheelchair to ambulate.

Mr. Scott M. Frotton, age 41, is a founding member of AWS. Mr. Frotton has T7 paraplegia secondary to a spinal cord injury sustained in a construction site accident in 1998. He has a complete loss of sensory and motor function from his chest down. His condition is permanent. He always uses a wheelchair to ambulate. Mr. Francis DeVito is a Korean War veteran and a member of AWS. In 1953, he was injured by a grenade and gunfire in an ambush attack while his Marine unit was on patrol in Korea. His wounds were such that it became medically necessary to amputate his left leg above the kneecap. He requires the use of ambulatory devices for mobility, including a prosthetic leg and a crutch, when necessary, in order to ambulate. Raymond J. Aziz, age 62, is a member of AWS. He has a mobility impairment secondary to adult onset of diabetes. He requires the use of leg braces from ambulation. Norman P. Crescimano, age 42, is a member of AWS. He has multiple sclerosis and always uses a wheelchair for ambulation. Mr. Frank Salafia, age 66, is a member of AWS. He is hearing impaired and has a loss of vision in one eye. Amylee O'Beirne, age 24, is a founding member of AWS. She has had rheumatoid arthritis since early childhood. She frequently uses a wheelchair for ambulation. Dino N. Theodore, age 44 is a member of AWS. He suffered an accidental gunshot wound to the T7 vertebrae in 1981. He is paraplegic. He always uses a wheelchair. John Pattavina, age 55, is a member of AWS. He is globally aphasic due to a left sided massive stroke which occurred in 2002. He is right sided paralyzed and sometimes requires the use of a wheelchair for ambulation. Peter DiPalma, age

55, is a member of AWS. Mr. DiPalma is quadriplegic. Robert Brearley, age 50, is a member of AWS. He suffered a traumatic spinal cord injury in 1980. He always uses a wheelchair. Robert L. Smith, III is a member of AWS. He always uses an electric wheelchair due to the combined problems of muscular dystrophy and a traumatic pelvic fracture in 2000. All of the above-named members of AWS are qualified individuals with disabilities within the meaning of the ADA and all other applicable federal and state statutes.

2. AWS is a civil rights group organized by individuals with disabilities to advocate for disabled persons' integration into society and equal access to all services, activities, programs, resources and facilities available to non-disabled persons. Its members are predominately, but not exclusively, individuals with various physical disabilities impairing mobility, vision and hearing. One of the primary purposes of AWS is to assure that places of public accommodation are accessible to, and usable by persons with disabilities. Title III of the ADA permits private individuals to bring lawsuits in which they can obtain court orders to stop discrimination on the basis of disability.
3. AWS and its members have suffered direct and indirect injury as a result of the defendants' actions or inactions as described herein. AWS also has been discriminated against because of its association with its members and their claims. The rights asserted by Mr. Esposito herein are germane to the organizational purpose of AWS and neither the claims herein, nor the relief requested would require individual participation by AWS members. The defendants' failure to comply with the ADA adversely affects the organizational purpose of AWS.

4. The plaintiff, Felix Esposito, resides at 5571 Lakeside Drive, 102, Margate, Florida, 33063. Mr. Esposito suffers from Neurological Conversion Reaction, a neurological illness that makes him dependant on a wheelchair for ambulation. He is a qualified individual with disabilities under the ADA and all other applicable federal and state statutes.
5. The defendant, Best Western International Inc., (hereinafter ("BWI")) is a membership organization incorporated as a non-profit corporation under the laws of the state of Arizona. BWI is registered to do business within Massachusetts as a foreign corporation. BWI has a principal place of business 6201 N. 24<sup>TH</sup> Parkway, Phoenix, Arizona 85016. Its resident Agent in Massachusetts is Prentice-Hall Corporation Systems, Inc., which has a business address of 84 State Street, Boston, MA.
6. The defendant, BWI provides service to Adams Inn Facilities, Inc. for Reservation Systems, Marketing, Sales and Advertising through fees and dues.
7. The defendant, 29 Hancock Street Limited Liability Company, (hereinafter "HSL") is a corporation organized under the laws of the state of Massachusetts. HSL is registered to do business within Massachusetts as a Domestic Limited Liability Company. HSL has a principal place of business at 29 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts, 02171.
8. The defendant, HSL, owns the hotel and real property known as Best Western Adams Inn, 29 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts, 02171.
9. The defendant, Adams Inn Facilities, Inc., (hereinafter "AIF") is a corporation organized under the laws of the state of Massachusetts. AIF is registered to do

business within Massachusetts as a Domestic Profit Corporation. AIF has a principal place of business at 29 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts, 02171.

10. The Best Western Adams Inn is a place of public accommodation which is subject to the requirements of the Title III of the ADA.
11. The defendant, BWI, is a private entity which operates a public accommodation as defined in Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(E).
12. The defendant, AIF, is a private entity which operates a public accommodation as defined in the Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 (7) (E).

**SYNOPSIS OF CAUSE OF ACTION UNDER ADA**

13. The ADA provides, "No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation." *42 U.S.C. § 12182(a)*.
14. The ADA public accommodations provisions also permit an individual to allege discrimination based on a reasonable belief that discrimination is about to occur. A plaintiff with a disability need not engage in the "futile gesture" of attempting to gain access to each and every feature of a facility or place of public accommodation where access barriers are known to exist and where the owner or operator does not intend to comply with the provisions of the ADA. *42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(1)*. The "futile gesture" provision extends so far as to allow a person

who uses a wheelchair to challenge the *planned* construction of a new place of public accommodation, such as a shopping mall, that would not be accessible to individuals who use wheelchairs. The resolution of such challenges prior to the construction of an inaccessible facility would enable any necessary remedial measures to be incorporated in the building planning stage, when such changes would be relatively inexpensive.

15. This case arises out of the defendants' unlawful practice of denying access to the facilities, goods and services offered at the Best Western Adams Inn to persons with disabilities.

#### **JURISDICTION**

16. The Court has primary jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 1343 in that this action arises under the laws of the United States and the defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction.
17. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337.
18. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391, the claim having arisen in the Massachusetts.
19. On September 7, 2004, Mr. Esposito stayed as a guest at Best Western Adams Inn and was denied access to the facilities, goods and services of Best Western Adams Inn due to its lack of accessibility and a lack of compliance with the ADA's requirements regarding the removal of architectural barriers to access by persons with disabilities.

20. Mr. Esposito intends to patronize Best Western Adams Inn in the future, but continues to be denied full and safe access to the hotel due to the violations that continue to exist there.

**COUNT I - VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT**

21. All events giving rise to this lawsuit occurred in the state of Massachusetts.
22. On or about July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the ADA, which is codified at 42 U.S.C. § 12181 and 28 C.F.R. Part 36.
23. The defendants have discriminated against the plaintiffs and continue to discriminate against the plaintiffs by denying them access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of Best Western Adams Inn as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and by failing to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).
24. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General, promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. The regulations are codified at 28 C.F.R. Part 36.
25. Best Western Adams Inn and the various businesses therein are places of public accommodation subject to the provisions of Title III of the ADA.
26. The Best Western Adams Inn web site located at <http://bwadamsinn.com/> states: "Handicapped accessible rooms available."

27. Mr. Esposito was a guest at the hotel in Room 118 on September 7, 2004. It was designated as and supposedly was a disabled accessible room, but really it was not.
28. During his stay at Best Western Adams Inn, Mr. Esposito observed, encountered, and suffered discrimination as a result of architectural barriers to access at Best Western Adams Inn. He left the hotel and went elsewhere in search of an accessible room.
29. Mr. Esposito wishes to return to Best Western Adams Inn as once the architectural barriers to access are removed.
30. Upon arriving for his stay on September 7, 2004, Mr. Esposito observed and encountered the architectural barriers to access as set forth below.
31. In the parking area, there are an insufficient number of spaces designated for disabled use, violating Sections 4.1.2 and 4.6.1 of the ADAAG.
32. The disabled use spaces do not have clear and level access aisles provided, violating Sections 4.1.2 and 4.6.3 of the ADAAG.
33. There is no accessible route from the parking areas to the facility, in violation of Sections 4.3.2, 4.6.2 and 4.6.3 of the ADAAG.
34. The signs designating the disabled use spaces are not posted at sufficient heights, in violation of Section 4.6.4 of the ADAAG.
35. The ramps provided from the parking areas to the facility have slopes, side-slopes and/or cross-slopes in excess of the limits prescribed in Section 4.8 of the ADAAG.
36. The disabled use spaces and/or unloading areas are located on a slope in violation of Section 4.6.3 and 4.6.6 of the ADAAG.

37. The doors at several of the building entrances are fitted with inaccessible hardware at the facility, in violation of Section 4.13.9 of the ADAAG.
38. There are doors at the facility that lack the required maneuvering clearances violating Section 4.13.6 and Figure 25 of the ADAAG.
39. There are stairs provided at the facility that do not comply with the standards prescribed in Section 4.9 of the ADAAG.
40. Room 118 did not provide a 36-inch clear floor space on both sides of the bed in violation of Section 9 of the ADAAG.
41. There are areas for storage provided without the clear floor space prescribed in Sections 4.2 and 9 of the ADAAG.
42. The rooms for disabled use provide elements with controls/dispensers outside of the required ranges violating Sections 4.2 of the ADAAG.
43. The rooms for disabled use are not equipped with proper door hardware violating Sections 4.13.9 and 9 of the ADAAG.
44. The sinks in the restroom provided in the room designated for disabled use do not meet the requirements prescribed in Sections 4.24 of the ADAAG.
45. The grab-bars in the restroom provided in the room designated for disabled use do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Sections 4.17.6 and 4.26 of the ADAAG.
46. The fixtures in the disabled use room have controls that are not easily operated with a closed fist in violation of the ADAAG.
47. The rooms for disabled use provide elements not equipped for use by the

hearing/visually impaired violating Section 9 of the ADAAG.

48. The rooms designated for disabled use do not provide a roll-in shower for use by the disabled, violating Section 9 of the ADAAG.
49. There are an insufficient number of guest rooms for persons with hearing impairments in violation of Section 9.1.3 of the ADAAG.
50. The disabled rooms are not dispersed among various classes of sleeping accommodations in violation of Section 9.1.4 of the ADAAG.
51. The defendants have failed to remove barriers to access by persons with mobility disabilities at Best Western Adams Inn where such barrier removal is readily achievable.
52. The defendants have failed to provide necessary auxiliary aids and services at Best Western Adams Inn where provision of such auxiliary aids and services would not pose any undue economic or architectural burden.
53. The defendants have failed to modify policies and procedures at Best Western Adams Inn where required to ensure equal access for persons with disabilities.
54. On information and belief, the plaintiffs allege that there are other violations present at Best Western Adams Inn and the businesses therein that will be more fully alleged upon discovery and further inspection.
55. The defendants have failed to make efforts required under the ADA to remove such barriers to the extent readily achievable nor have the defendants complied with accessibility standards to the maximum feasible.
56. The defendants have also, by maintaining such barriers, failed to comply with ADA and access requirements for areas of new construction or alteration.

57. All alterations that could affect the usability of a facility must be made in an accessible manner to the maximum extent feasible.
58. The actions and initiatives which the defendants have failed to undertake in order to make Best Western Adams Inn accessible to persons with disabilities are actions and initiatives that would be readily achievable, required by law, and would greatly assist persons with mobility disabilities at minimal expense to the defendants.
59. The defendants' conduct constitutes ongoing and continuous violations of the ADA and, unless restrained from doing so, the defendants will continue to violate the ADA. Said conduct, unless enjoined, will continue to inflict injuries for which the plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff demands all compensatory and exemplary damages permitted by statute and all attorneys' fees and costs permitted by statute.

**COUNT II-MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL LAWS c.272 § 98**

60. The plaintiff repeats the preceding allegations as if set forth completely here.
61. Under Massachusetts General Laws c. 272, § 98, "All persons shall have the right to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities and privileges of any place of public accommodation, resort or amusement subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law and applicable to all persons. This right is recognized and declared to be a civil right."
62. As stated above in Count I, Felix Esposito has been denied equal access to a place of public accommodation in violation of his civil rights because of the above-described barriers to wheelchair access at the 29 Hancock Street Best Western

Adams Inn.

63. Until the above-described barriers to wheelchair access are removed from the 29 Hancock Street Best Western Adams Inn, the plaintiff will be denied equal access to a place of public accommodation in violation of his civil rights.
64. The plaintiff, Felix Esposito, has met the administrative prerequisite of filing a claim in the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination ("MCAD") in regard to his present cause of action under Massachusetts General Laws c. 272, § 98. Mr. Esposito, through counsel, has requested that the MCAD release his claim for judicial determination in this Court.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff demands all compensatory and exemplary damages permitted by statute and all attorneys' fees and costs permitted by statute.

**COUNT III – MASSACHUSETTS CONSTITUTION and G.L. c.93 § 103**

65. The plaintiffs repeat the preceding allegations as if fully set forth here.
66. Article 114 of the Massachusetts Constitution prohibits discrimination on the basis of a person's disability within Massachusetts.
67. Implementing Article 114 to the Massachusetts Constitution, G.L. c.93 § 103, the Massachusetts Equal Rights Law, guarantees person with disabilities the same rights as other persons, such as the right to make contracts, to purchase personal property, to participate in lawsuits and to receive the full benefit and protection of the laws.
68. As described in Count I, the plaintiff has been excluded from full and equal participation in patronizing Best Western Adams Inn and the businesses therein to the same extent as non-disabled patrons. Based upon the totality of the

circumstances, Mr. Esposito has been denied the benefits afforded to non-disabled patrons. He has been subject to ongoing discrimination by the defendants solely by reason of his disability as prohibited by Article 114 of the Massachusetts Constitution and G.L. c.93 § 103.

69. The plaintiff has been distressed and inconvenienced by the discriminatory actions of the defendants, including their failure to remove access barriers at Best Western Adams Inn and the businesses therein and their failure to modify policies and procedures to accommodate disabled customers such as Mr. Esposito.
70. The plaintiff's constitutional right to be free from discrimination in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been and continues to be violated by the defendants and he is therefore entitled to compensatory and exemplary damages for his injuries.
71. The plaintiff, Felix Esposito, has met the administrative prerequisite of filing a claim in the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination ("MCAD") in regard to his present cause of action under G.L. c.93 § 103. Mr. Esposito, through counsel, has requested that the MCAD release his claim for judicial determination in this Court.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff demands all compensatory and exemplary damages permitted by statute and all attorneys' fees and costs permitted by statute.

**THE PLAINTIFFS DEMAND A JURY TRIAL ON COUNTS II AND III.**

Respectfully submitted,  
The Plaintiffs,

ACCESS WITH SUCCESS, INC. and  
FELIX ESPOSITO,

By their Attorneys,

Nicholas S. Guerrera  
Nicholas S. Guerrera, BBO#551475  
Shaheen Guerrera & O'Leary, LLC  
Jefferson Office Park  
820A Turnpike Street  
North Andover, MA 01845  
(978) 689-0800

Ann Marie Pattavina  
Ann Marie Pattavina, BBO#565910  
Law Office of Ann Marie Pattavina  
Two Dundee Park, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Andover, MA 01810  
(978) 247-7188

Michael J. Bellanti  
Michael J. Bellanti, BBO#645405  
Law Office of Michael J. Bellanti  
Two Dundee Park, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Andover, MA 01810  
(978) 247-7188

Dated: 2/18/05

1. Title of case (name of first party on each side only):

Esposito v. Best Western International, Inc.

2. Category in which the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the Civil Cover Sheet. (See local rule 40.1(a)(1)).

1. 160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.

2. 195, 368, 400, ~~440~~ 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, \*Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cases  
740, 790, 791, 820\*, 830\*, 840\*, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950.

3. 110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.

4. 220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.

5. V. 150, 152, 153.

3. Title and number, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in this district please indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court.

None.

4. Has a prior action between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court?

YES  NO 

5. Does the complaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See 28 USC §2403)

YES  NO 

If so, is the U.S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party?

YES  NO 

6. Is this case required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284?

YES  NO 

7. Do all of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)).

YES  NO 

A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside?

Eastern Division  Central Division  Western Division 

B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?

Eastern Division  Central Division  Western Division 

8. If filing a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions)

YES  NO 

(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT)

ATTORNEY'S NAME Nicholas S. Guerrera, Shaheen Guerrera & O'Leary, LLCADDRESS 820A Turnpike St., North Andover, MA 01845TELEPHONE NO. (978) 689-0800 Fax: (978) 794-0890

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

## I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Access with Success, Inc.  
Felix Esposito

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Middlesex, MA  
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

DEFENDANTS FILED  
CLERKS OFFICE  
Best Western International, Inc.

725 FEB 22 P 3:15  
County of Residence of First Listed

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN CIVIL CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE  
DISTRICT OF MASS

Attorneys (If Known)

N/A

## II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

1 U.S. Government Plaintiff  3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)

2 U.S. Government Defendant  4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

## III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

Citizen of This State <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4
Citizen of Another State <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 6

## IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury Med. Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability <b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs. <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <b>PROPERTY RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark <b>LABOR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 750 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act <b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (13950) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIW C/DIW W (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSDI Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) <b>FEDERAL TAXSUITS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS Third Party 26 USC 7609
<b>REAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/ Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	<b>PRISONER PETITIONS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition	Transferred from another district (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Multidistrict Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment	

## V. ORIGIN (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

1 Original Proceeding  2 Removed from State Court  3 Remanded from Appellate Court  4 Reinstated or  5 Reopened

Transferred from another district (specify)

6 Multidistrict Litigation  7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write brief statement of cause.)  
Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)

42 USC §12181 et seq. Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Action for Injunctive relief to compel defendant to remove architectural barriers to persons with mobility disabilities in place of public accommodation. and pending state civil rights claims.

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:  CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  
JURY DEMAND:  Yes  No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions):  
IF ANY

JUDGE  
E

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE